

REMARKS

The office action of December 15, 2004 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-21 remain in this case, claims 1, 8, and 15 being amended, and claims 6-7, 13-14, and 20-22 being cancelled by this response.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Crain.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, claims 6 and 7 have been incorporated into claim 1 and claims 13 and 14 have been incorporated into claim 8 to further prosecution of the application. Since the Examiner stated that claims 7 and 14 are allowable, claims 1 and 8 should now be allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 8 are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-4 and 10-11, being dependent upon and further limiting claims 1 and 8, respectively, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-4 and 10-11 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wilson.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, claims 6 and 7 have been incorporated into claim 1 and claims 13 and 14 have been incorporated into claim 8 to further prosecution of the application. Since the Examiner stated that claims 7 and 14 are allowable, claims 1 and 8 should now be allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 8 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 9-11, being dependent upon and further limiting claims 1 and 8, respectively, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations

they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 and 9-11 are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crain.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, claims 6 and 7 have been incorporated into claim 1 and claims 13 and 14 have been incorporated into claim 8 to further prosecution of the application. Since the Examiner stated that claims 7 and 14 are allowable, claims 1 and 8, upon which claims 5 and 12 depend, respectively, should now be allowable.

Claims 5 and 12, being dependent upon and further limiting claims 1 and 8, respectively, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 12 are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, claims 6 and 7 have been incorporated into claim 1 and claims 13 and 14 have been incorporated into claim 8 to further prosecution of the application. Since the Examiner stated that claims 7 and 14 are allowable, claims 1 and 8, upon which claims 5 and 12 depend, respectively, should now be allowable.

Claims 5 and 12, being dependent upon and further limiting claims 1 and 8, respectively, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 12 are respectfully requested.

Claims 15-18, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dill in view of Wilson.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, claims 20 and 21 have been incorporated into claim 15 to further prosecution of the application, and claim 22 has been cancelled. Since the Examiner stated that claim 21 is allowable, claim 15 should now be allowable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 are respectfully requested.

Claims 16-18, being dependent upon and further limiting claim 15, should also be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-18 are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 14, and 21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Such action has been taken, as noted above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:

Enos et al.

By: 

Meghan Van Deeuwen, Reg. No. 45,612
Attorney for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.
Ithaca, NY 14850

(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)

e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com

Dated: 5/14/05